



6.71  
m 19s

# SPEECHES

GEN. LIB.

OF

**HON. ALEXANDER MACKENZIE,**

**PREMIER AND MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS,**

AND

**Hon. RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,**

**MINISTER OF FINANCE,**

AT

**ST. JOHN, N. B.,**

**Thursday, August 22nd, 1878.**

SAINT JOHN, N. B.:

PRINTED AT THE "DAILY NEWS" STEAM JOB OFFICE, CANTERBURY STREET,  
1878.

2105<sup>a</sup>  
2105<sup>a</sup> ✓

R FOR REFERENCE

329.971

unc

Life

Adult

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THE ROOM

2105e

Address

Thursda  
the Reform  
sence of  
Finance, t  
Rink at  
welcome  
greeted, th  
and around  
siastic mar  
ing to hear  
visitors o  
produced  
citizens.  
ble impre  
were broug  
kenzie an  
them, and  
our city an  
hand the  
feeling t  
dially re  
fair hear  
large num  
Rink, and  
Messrs. M  
Hon. Mr.  
drove to th  
ed with en  
being pres  
A large pl  
side oppos  
ing, a grea  
body of th  
One the pl  
numbers o  
Carleton,  
sides repre  
of the Pro  
form and a  
gentlemen  
of Custon  
Anglin, J.  
Brydges,  
Messrs. C  
George G.  
S. Baker,  
Hamm, R  
J. Harris  
George F.  
Wetmore,  
Timothy  
Clerk, P. C.



## Address to Hon. Messrs MACKENZIE and CARTWRIGHT, AND THEIR REPLY.

Thursday was a day of great interest to the Reform Party in this city. The presence of the Premier and Minister of Finance, the very large gathering at the Rink at 10 a. m., and the enthusiastic welcome with which they were there greeted, their visit to points of interest in and around the city, the large and enthusiastic mass-meeting at the Rink last evening to hear the opinions of the distinguished visitors on the public topics of the day, produced a favorable impression on our citizens. We are sensible that the favorable impression was mutual, that all who were brought in contact with Messrs. Mackenzie and Cartwright were pleased with them, and the interest they manifested in our city and its industries, and on the other hand the visitors leave the city with a feeling that they have been cordially received, and have had a fair hearing. Yesterday morning a large number of citizens gathered at the Rink, and at ten in the morning the Hon. Messrs. Mackenzie and Cartwright, with Hon. Mr. Burpee and C. W. Weldon, Esq., drove to the Rink, where they were received with enthusiasm, the City Cornet Band being present to do honor to the occasion. A large platform had been erected on the side opposite to the entrance of the building, a great portion of the remainder of the body of the Rink being filled with seats. One the platform and front seats were large numbers of citizens, with delegations from Carleton, Portland and Indiantown, besides representatives from various sections of the Province. Among those on the platform and adjoining seats were the following gentlemen: Hon. Isaac Burpee, Minister of Customs; Senator Lewin, Hon. Mr. Anglin, J. S. Boies DeVeber, M. P., C. J. Brydges, Esq., C. W. Weldon, Esq., Messrs. Chas. Burpee, M. P., Sunbury; George G. King, Queens County; George S. Baker, Stephen E. Stevens, Matthias Hamm, Robert Robinson, Arthur McLean, J. Harrison, Henry Maher, Uriah Drake, George F. Harding, D. W. Clerk, E. J. Wetmore, Robert Coleman, C. J. Cain, Timothy Cusack, S. P. Osgood, Charles Clerk, P. Gleeson, John Cochran, J. R.

Rigby, S. Strang, Alex. McDermott, B. Coholan, Geo. F. Fleming, Dr. Alward, Silas Alward, A. A. Stockton, Wm. Elder, M. P. P., William Lawlor, R. C. Dunn, M. D. Austin, George E. Snider, A. G. Blakelley, J. W. Lawrence, John Livingston, Edward Willis, M. P. P., Geo. H. Lawrence, W. M. McLean, John Melick, Robert Carson, I. Allen Jack, William Jack, E. R. Moore, R. P. Butler, W. W. McPeters, J. V. Troop, Charles Lawton, Dr. Travers, John Clark, Esq., Robt. Blair, Esq., J. Travis, Esq., Rev. Mr. Hartley and others.

A. Chipman Smith, Esq., chairman, on behalf of the citizens read the following address of welcome:

TO THE HONORABLE ALEXANDER MACKENZIE, PREMIER, AND THE HONORABLE R. J. CARTWRIGHT, FINANCE MINISTER OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA:

The Liberals of New Brunswick bid you welcome to the City of Saint John.

For nearly five years, the Government, of which you are distinguished ornaments, has administered with great success and ability the affairs of the Dominion of Canada.

Notwithstanding the great depression of trade and commerce throughout the world and the consequent shrinkage in values, your Government by judicious management and strict economy and a correct fiscal policy has been enabled to maintain the credit of the country both at home and abroad.

The wise administration of the Finances of the country, by which the general rate of interest on the Public Debt of Canada has been materially decreased, must be a subject of great gratification to all.

The prudent foresight exhibited in the management of the Public Works of the Dominion so as not unduly to press upon the tax-payers of the country in a season of unexampled depression, while at the same time not neglecting the necessary development of the Dominion, must inspire confidence in your conduct of public affairs.

The Policy of your Government, while it commands the enlightened and general approbation of Canadians throughout all the Provinces, is especially worthy of commendation and support at the hands of the people of the Maritime Provinces. The impartial and statesman-like manner in which your Government has protected our interests is the most conclusive refutation of the charges of the Opposition that you are hostile to the Maritime Provinces.

We bid you welcome to our Province and give you the heartiest assurance that your Government will be handsomely sustained throughout this Province at the approaching General Election.

A. CHIPMAN SMITH,  
Chairman to General Committee.

W. A. LOCKHART,  
General Secretary.

St. John, N. B., 22d August, 1878.

## HON. MR. MACKENZIE'S SPEECH.

The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, on rising to reply to the address, was received with cheers. He said: Mr. Smith and gentlemen of St. John; it is with no small gratification that I am able to-day, as one of the Canadian Ministers, to meet with so many Reformers of the city of St. John, on my visit to these Provinces. I thank you for the kind words you have used with reference to the Ministry of which Mr. Cartwright and myself are members, and can say that whatever shortcomings or failures may have been attributed to us in the conduct of public affairs, you, I think, have done us no more than justice in crediting us with doing justice to the Provinces, without regard to sectional interests. (Cheers.) As observers of nations and events, we cannot but be struck with the fact that their prosperity largely depends on commerce, and that unless they are possessed of great trading advantages they cannot hope to maintain a rivalry with more favored nations. To cultivate Canadian commerce, therefore, is the sure road to prosperity, not only to the Maritime Provinces, but to the whole of the Dominion. Therefore, if we seem to favor the Maritime Provinces it is because we may be the better enabled to carry on foreign commerce—not that we may secure their good will alone. (Cheers.)

We have long professed Liberal opinions, and have done so under peculiar difficulties, but I will speak of that more fully this evening, merely saying here that apart from these there are others which have caused the Government no little anxiety.

Mr. Mackenzie then referred to the United States, with a frontier extending thousands of miles alongside ours, with a policy hostile to our own and the Mother Country. He hoped that Canada, small and insignificant as it now is, will in the future be able to give its larger and older neighbor a lesson in fiscal and commercial principles. He would show in the evening that notwithstanding the hostility of tariffs and great comparative difficulties operating against us that we had thus far worked up a prosperity on a more substantial basis than the United States. (Cheers.) The Government pursued their policy, he said, against a politically bankrupt opposition.

He continued: Drowning men catch at straws, and, no doubt, the Opposition feel that any support is better than political destruction, but, for my own part, I should prefer to sink rather than consent to sink those principles for which I have so long contended; better that my party should perish than that they should desert sound and wholesome principles for the sake of remaining in power. (Cheers.) If you think that the views of policy put forth by the Opposition are preferable to ours, you should give them your support. (Cries of no! no!) But if you believe we are right and protection is wrong, then, irrespective of the personnel of the present Administration, it will be your duty to support us and our sound commercial policy. (Cheers.) I feel that if my views had been taken years ago with reference to the means of communication and the proper route between the seaboard, much better means of internal communication would now exist. (Cheers.)

While I am in power I shall take every means to discharge the duties of government irrespective of local and sectional considerations. (Hear! hear!) And in appropriating public monies now as in the future, I hope our course will be such as to give no just cause of offence to the masses. (Cheers.) Our

country is a vast one. We must yet open it up by a vast railroad, canal and water system, we have yet enormous works before us, we have a vast country to settle, and we have to put our shoulders to the wheel, and create for ourselves a powerful Empire on this Continent ready and willing to take its share of Imperial burdens, and, in connection with England, or side by side with her, receive the just reward of enterprise and determination. (Hear! hear! and loud cheers.)

Public men are always charged with fusing their public influence for party purposes. I believe that no parliamentary system of Government can be carried on successfully in this country, except by party administration. The same views have been expressed by such great parliamentary leaders as Sir Robert Peel, Lord Melbourne and Lord Beaconsfield. It is a subterfuge to tell that a government can be carried on except by party. It is essential for us in Canada either to have a Liberal or a Tory party governing the country. A pure Government is only attainable by means of party and a properly organized Opposition. I hail with pleasure that part of your address to which you say that you intend to support the Government at the approaching general election. (Cheers.)

I would be unworthy of the name of Liberal if I failed to appreciate the support of the people of the Maritime Provinces. I look back with pride to the names that built up the constitutional system as could alone give permanence to our institutions as a part of the British Empire. (Cheers.) Our opponents characterized themselves by attempting to erect an established church in Canada, to take our great national university from us and make it a denominational, and to establish a political oligarchy. But these troubles have all passed away, and we have now prosperity in our own hands. If we conduct the government of the country on a sound basis, a vast amount of the prosperity which the mother country possesses will be ours, and we shall hand down to our children a heritage and to less favored nations an example of the benefits and blessings of self-government and of a sound political system. (Cheers.)

In closing my reply to your very kind address, I have to express my extreme gratification at the reception we have everywhere met with in the Lower Provinces, if I may except one place where a certain number of people, opposed to the Government, endeavored to make themselves conspicuous by violence. I do not, sir, anticipate anything of that kind in this community (hear, hear), nor do I believe that if it were possible for my own political friends to adopt such tactics, though I am sure it is not, I do not believe anything is more conducive to the prosperity of a political party than perfect fairness and justice in discussing public affairs (hear, hear, and cheers). The tidings from the East and the West, from the South to the North, are all of a most favorable character, as regards the permanence of the Liberal party in Canada. (Cheers.) I thank you most sincerely, Mr. Smith and gentlemen of the committee, for your kind address and I shall continue as long as I live to remember your kindness and by my public acts, to give such confidence as it is possible for me to give, to those who support our administration and I express the hope that we shall not do anything which will cause you to regret the course you have taken to-day. (Loud applause.)

## HON. MR. CARTWRIGHT'S SPEECH.

The Chairman then called on Mr. Cartwright, who rose amid loud cheers. He said that his hon. friend the Premier had the advantage of him in having often visited this city and Province, while this was his (Mr. Cartwright's) first visit to the Maritime Provinces. He regretted that his official duties prevented his neglecting this task so long, inasmuch as he had always felt that in a permanent confederation, the western provinces and the eastern provinces should come to understand each

other better, should know each other's wants and desires and should be able to acquaint themselves with each other. They had said with truth that their party had come into office at a period of very great commercial depression. He could not pretend that thirteen men in a Government did nothing in five years to which objection would be raised, but he considered that they did nothing for which good reasons could not be given, and they did nothing for actual advantage to themselves or

for sectional purposes. Unfortunately the Government had not been able to see the way clear to make every man rich by doubling his taxes; they have not seen the way clear to tax the poor man's bread and fuel, and to-night they are to be put upon their trial on the strangest charge ever made against a constitutional Government—that they deliberately and with malice prepense have refused to add enormously to the burdens of the country! Mr. Cartwright sat down after being loudly applauded.

Mr. Smith proposed three cheers for the visitors, which were given with a will, and a hearty "tiger" followed. The meeting then broke up.

Afterwards a number of leading gentlemen were introduced to Messrs. Mackenzie and Cartwright.

The 62nd Batt. Band, the Carleton Serrade Band, as well as the City Cornet Band were present, and played a few airs before and after the meeting. The crowds of citizens then dispersed the Bands leading the way and playing several lively marches on their way up town.

In the afternoon Messrs. Mackenzie and Cartwright visited the Reform party's Committee Rooms in the City Hall, Carleton, where a large number had assembled. Upon their arrival they were very heartily greeted. The Ministers were accompanied by the Hon. Isaac Burpee, Minister of Customs, and C. W. Weldon, Esq. The party repaired to the large room of the hall on the first floor and Mr. R. N. Knight took the chair, and on behalf of the assembly requested the Ministers to make a few remarks. Mr. Mackenzie stepped to the platform and said that he appeared there on this occasion with a double object. First he was desirous of helping his party and everything he could say in favor of Messrs. Burpee and DeVeber and Weldon he was only too glad to say. And he was sure he would have Mr. Weldon's support in the next Parliament. He also wished to shake hands with the friends of the Government and this was his second object. He and Mr. Cartwright were considered the talking machines of the Government, but it would be impossible to enter into politics to-day as he had a good deal of speaking to do this evening. The time had come, he said, when it was necessary for all to take an interest in the political issues of the day, and he was sure the people of these Provinces were sufficiently posted on these questions to understand how to cast their votes at the approaching election without the aid of speeches from him and his colleague, Mr. Cartwright. He briefly referred to the question of protection. He was glad to know that in this country every man stands equal in the eyes of the law. He alluded to the reactionary doctrines of the day, and said, we have them in this country as well as in the old country. "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance,"

it has been said. He did not think the Liberal party in the Provinces could be interfered with, though he thought the public should be learned in political ethics, and at all events he was certain the popular mind was in harmony with the present administration. It was surprising what one vote could do. Sometimes it decides the fate of Governments, and here he related several stories, pointing out the value of one vote. He always has felt and feels now as much interest in the Maritime Provinces as he does in his own, and he was glad to think the Lower and Upper Provinces are so much allied to each other, and he hoped that the community of interests would continue to grow and that the country would prosper accordingly. He was glad to be among the people of Carleton and he was confident they would endeavor to their utmost ability to return the Reform party candidates. The Hon. Premier took his seat amidst a burst of applause.

Loud and continued calls for Mr. Cartwright brought that gentleman before the audience. It had not been his intention, he said, to say anything, but, to such a large, influential and intelligent assembly he could not, after such a desire was manifested for him to speak, retire without saying a few words, though it must be considered he was down for a lengthy address this evening. In reality Mr. Mackenzie was the general monthpiece of the Government, but he (Mr. Cartwright) was glad to address the people of the Provinces where the Opposition papers say the Government have only a minority; but he could not see that the large numbers present to-day, almost without notice, showed the Government in the minority. The Finance Minister is brought to account for a great many things—even the failure of the crops he is blamed for; the shrinkage of \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 real estate is due to his mistakes; the languished lumber trade is his error, and a number of other depressed industries are very generously cast on his shoulders, but the people know the cause of this. However, he hoped to be able to revisit the Provinces again and, after the warm reception accorded to him here to-day and elsewhere, it would be his endeavor to come again and make himself more fully acquainted with the Provinces. He thanked the people for their hearty reception, and on taking his seat he was loudly applauded.

Hon. Mr. Burpee was called for, and in response he said he was glad to see such a grand reception, and hoped it represented a victory soon to take place. Cheers rent the air and Mr. DeVeber was brought forward. He made a brief speech, and was followed by Mr. Weldon, who also made a few appropriate remarks.

## MASS MEETING AT THE RINK.

Probably the grandest political mass-meeting ever held in this city was that convened at the Rink last evening. Nearly every section of the Province and every shade of political opinion was represented. The attendance could not have been less than 7,000 or 8,000 persons, among whom was a sprinkling of the fair sex. Every available seat within hearing distance was occupied long before the speeches began, and those who came after that filled every avenue in front, side and rear of the platform, until the speakers were fenced in with a "Chinese wall" of human beings. Among those seated on the platform were the following ladies and gentlemen—

Sir A. J. Smith, John J. Fraser, C. J. Brydges, E. Willis, M. P. P., Chas. Burpee, Dr. Sharp, G. G. King, W. Dell Perley, W. H. White, Dr. Alward, M. Lindsay,

W. H. Rourke, Gen. Warner, Gorman Steeves, C. F. Clinch, S. Alward, Chas. A. Stockton, Henry Jack, William Davidson, W. A. Adams, Dr. Baxter, Henry J. Leonard, A. L. Palmer, Dr. Travers, M. Hamm, Gilbert Bent, Henry Ranney, Jas. McMillan, M. W. Maher, Frank Woods, M. P. P., H. R. Ranney, E. J. Wetmore, T. Cusick, J. Alfred Clarke, R. C. Scovil, Geo. Blake, F. W. Wisdom, C. G. Berryman, John Farris, E. H. McAlpine, A. Stirling, W. H. Olive, R. T. A. Scott, R. T. Babbitt, J. P. Jarvis, John Mager, Hon. Isaac Burpee, J. S. B. DeVeber, Morris Robinson, N. Shaw, John A. Wright, D. J. Purdy, R. W. Thorne, E. J. Frost, R. Blair, James Milligan, George Patterson, T. Otty Crookshank, J. V. Troop, Alex. Duff, George Fleming, Hon. W. E. Perley, Hon. J. D. Lewin, Hon. S. L. Tilley, James



Vernon, Geo. Morrison, jr., J. Bulloch, Dr. Peters, Rev. E. J. Hopper, T. Coughlan, Judge Watters, C. W. Weldon, R. Marshall, M.P.P., R. Milligan, W. Sears, Frank Collins, J. W. Lawrence, J. B. Hamm, W. A. Quinton, Sheriff Harding, Adam Young, J. C. Ferguson, R. P. McGivern, Thomas Murray, John Tucker, Charles Burpee, jr., Coroner Rigby, J.P.C. Burpee, Captain Jones, E. C. Jones, Bank Montreal, W. A. Lockhart, F. P. Thompson, M.P.P., George Phillips, John Lockhart, J. M. D. Keator, E. R. Gregory, William Jack, D. J. McLaughlin, E. R. Moore, Henry Maher, Roland Hill, Jeremiah Harrison, J. L. Dunn, John Wallace, M.P., J. V. Thurgar, Rev. Henry Pope, Rev. Dr. MacIise, Henry Vaughan, Rev. John Collins, Rev. Mr. Chappell, John Frederickson, A. G. Bowes, J. R. Ruel, J. Morris Robinson, Bank N.S., Henry J. Thorne, R. C. Thorne, W. Watson Allan, W. H. Harrison, Richard Thompson, W. H. Beer, Dr. Caldwell, J. S. B. DeVeher, D. Nagy, S. Strang, S. R. Thompson, T. W. Daniel, D. McLellan, M.P.P., R. J. Flaherty, X. Perry, Alex. Lockhart, Dudne Breeze, E. J. Wetmore, Dr. Sheffield, S. DeVenne, C. E. Burnham, Joshua Turner, S. L. Peters,

D. R. Munro, A. F. Killam, M. P. P., I. Allen Jack, George Harding, L. Almon, M. D. Austin, Henry Mellick, George E. McLaughlin, Henry Gorrie, Alderman Wilson, R. Carson, James Holly, Moses Lawrence, C. J. Burpee, Alex. Christie, Wm. M. McLean, John Tapley, Hon. John McMillan, John V. Ellis, James Domville, Esq., Thos. Keohan, Hugh McCafferty, S. F. Mathews, James Hegan, George Hegan, Wm. Pugsley, Saml. Walsh, Thomas S. Weeks, R. Puddington, William Ranney, David Douglas, (Amherst), John Anderson, J. R. Stone, G. Rix Price, Sheriff Temple, (York), J. H. Cother, T. H. Hall, W. A. Moore, Geo. W. Gerow, Dr. F. E. Barker, W. J. Logan, James O'Brien, Walter J. Scovil, Cornelius Cain, E. Lantallum, A. C. A. Salter, Peter Flanagan, Wm. Colier, (B. B. N. A.), Rev'd Mr. Burgess, James Reynolds, Edwin Fisher, Thomas Gilbert, E. C. Adams, Geo. H. Martin, John Wilson, Chas. McLaughlan, C. E. Scammell, and others.

The chairman, A. Chipman Smith, Esq., on rising, briefly explained the object of the meeting. He then introduced the first speaker of the evening—Hon. Alex. Mackenzie.

## HON. MR. MACKENZIE'S SPEECH.

advert to some of the extravagant state-

Mr. Mackenzie, who was received with loud cheering, then addressed the meeting. He said:—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chairman has explained to you the circumstances under which my colleague and myself have met you here to-night. If we had known a week earlier, it is probable that we might have been able to make arrangements of a more extensive character than was possible for us to-night, but the first intimation I had of any desire to discuss public questions with us was a telegram I received in Charlottetown a little before going to our own meeting on Monday afternoon, and it was impossible after that, with other arrangements made, that we could break through any arrangements we had allotted to other places.

I shall endeavor to pass as rapidly as possible through the subjects upon which I propose to address you. My colleague, the Minister of Finance, and myself, are here for the first time to address an audience in St. John. At the present moment when a general election is pending there is necessarily more or less political excitement all over the country, and I am quite disposed on account of that political excitement to make some allowance for the extravagance of the statements, inaccuracy in fact, on the part of our opponents. At the same time, sir, it will be my duty to-night to

ments which have been made from time to time, and notably on a very recent occasion by the two hon. gentlemen who are here to speak after me to-night. I quite admit that when an Administration is appealing to the country, after being in office five years, it is but right to the public, it is but just to themselves that they should fairly lay before the public at least an epitome of the policy which has guided and controlled them during the time they have held power, and we appear before you to-night in contradistinction to the leaders of the Opposition.

The Reform party are differing chiefly on a matter of policy with the Tory or Opposition party, in that they are committing themselves to a protectionist policy, while we are denouncing it as one inimical to the prosperity of the country. (Cheers.) I do not for a moment desire here, any more than at any other place in Canada, to take ground which might be more advantageous to myself in the presence of the population of a particular part of the Dominion. I am perfectly aware that in the Maritime Provinces there is a sentiment strongly predominant in favor of freedom of trade. Well, I am equally aware that in some cities of Old Canada there is a sentiment prevailing to a large extent and influencing to a considerable extent public opinion in favor of a protectionist policy; but, sir, no public man would be justified because a considerable portion of people are in favor of a policy which is wrong in it-

self in seeking for a moment to give practical effect to such views by legislation. It is our duty clearly as an Administration, if we fail to convince the people of the righteousness of our cause and the uprightness of our character as administrators, to make way for other men. And, on the other hand, it will be the duty of the people, if our views are in accordance with sound policy, in accordance with the enlightened system of commercial legislation, which prevails in England and throughout every one of the Colonies of Great Britain but one, to support the Government in maintaining, so far as it is possible to do so, in our revenue system, a policy of perfect freedom from all restrictions which interfere with the regular course of trade. I would be exceedingly obliged, though I know it is difficult, for the audience to keep as quiet as possible, and I shall endeavor to make my voice heard, and I think I can do it if perfect stillness is maintained, otherwise it is quite impossible. When we assumed office in 1873 we assumed office at a time when a depression in business was looming in the distance. We assumed office at a time when extraordinary burdens had been assumed by the then Government, in addition to those which had previously existed. Burdens which imposed in one year an additional expenditure of between four and five millions of dollars. It became speedily apparent to the Administration that with a coming shrinkage in values, with a coming depression in trade, the shadow of which was then beginning to be cast over the land, it would be necessary to adopt, so far as it was possible to do so, a policy of retrenchment instead of one of extravagance, especially as we had other obligations maturing which would make it impossible for us to avoid a rapid accumulation of the public debt. And I may say at the moment that no accumulation of public debt has taken place since our advent to office, except such as was necessarily occasioned by the legislation or administrative action of the previous government. (Cheers.) And when you are told that this Government is responsible for an increase in the debt, it is an entire error, to use a very ordinary and simple word, and when you are told that we have increased the burden of taxation, that is also entirely beyond the mark, for we have, instead of increasing it, as my friend the Minister of Finance will, no doubt, show you to-night, absolutely decreased the burden of taxation upon the people. (Cheers.) It will be my duty to-night, during the short time I have to address you, to point out to you many matters of general interest in connection with the policy of the Government on the trade question to which I have alluded, and on the policy of the Government with regard to economy and eco-

nomical administration of affairs, and the improvements in our legislation and administrative system which have been effected by our efforts, and I know I do not appeal in vain to this or any other audience for that sympathy and support which a difficult and embarrassed position entitled us to from the moment we assumed the cares of office. (Cheers.) I know, sir, we are accused by our opponents of having caused the depression in trade; it is true that Mr. Tilley, with a little more manliness than what has characterized his associates in Opposition, has admitted it was not due to the Government that this commercial depression had overspread the land, but on the other hand his colleagues in Opposition have been endeavoring to make people believe that but for the advent of the Liberal Government to power there would be no shadow of depression cast over the country. They have led the people, or tried to lead the people to believe that the administration could remove or prevent the depression coming by merely passing some acts of Parliament. Now I quite admit it is possible by acts of Parliament to remove the money from one class of the community and place it in the pockets of another class of the community. I admit it is quite possible to impose a system of taxation which will benefit a community of small number, but will seriously injure the vast mass of the people who, in this country, are the taxpayers of the community, and I know, too, that the class which would be benefited by this species of class legislation which is advocated under the name of Protection, are perhaps the most powerful individuals in the community. I know it is possible to get political support from that class who have so much to gain by protection, while those who would have to bear the burden of taxation have only their votes to give in support of a really national policy.

Now, sir, what is the National Policy, so called. No policy can be called thoroughly national which proposes to protect a certain class of the community, and leave all the others unprotected, and this is precisely what a system of protection means. It is a system which in the course of a few years will ensure a much larger percentage of poverty than exists at the present time. It is a system which would build up a few great firms or individuals in some particular manufacturing business and make them millionaires, but for every dollar that is added to the coffers of the rich manufacturer there are two dollars extracted from those who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. (Cheers.) I have the pleasure to-night of doing what I did some weeks ago at Toronto, of addressing principally a city audience, and I am glad to have the privilege because it



is in the cities where the heresy of protection has chiefly taken root, and I know I am addressing intelligent working men, many of whom have been led to believe that a system of protection would lead to the immediate establishment of large manufacturing and that that would necessarily require a larger number of mechanics, artisans and laborers, in order to carry on those works, and it is perhaps quite true that for a time a manufacturer here and there would be able to employ some few additional hands, but, as I pointed out at Toronto, it would be a benefit of so temporary a character, a benefit of such doubtful utility, that no nation or people who have studied the political history of the world would dream for a moment of submitting to so odious a system. We have fortunately on this continent two systems of government. In the United States they have a system like our own—almost purely democratic, but we have an old English Constitution, loving people, we have those who understand the policy of their Mother Country, who know what it is that has made England great and powerful as a commercial, manufacturing and industrial people, and it is our clear duty to follow in the wake of the Mother Land, when we are able to point to such magnificent results as the natural result of their policy. In the United States, it is true, they have no aristocracy, no privileged class in the eyes of the law, but they have a worse system of class legislation. They have made it a regular part of their political system to protect certain classes. The woollen and cotton and the iron interests will all combine and they will together prey upon the laboring and farming classes, for it is only those who labor who are the real producers of wealth and it is only to them that any country can look for the amount of realized wealth in any community. Now, sir, we will suppose that our opponents, the Protectionists, are to succeed at this election, and that they will impose a protective tariff. We will suppose that, stimulated by the certainty of greater gains for a time, the manufacturers of various articles will commence building new works, and knowing that they will have a profit far exceeding what the present tariff gives them, if they have twenty or twenty-five per cent., they know a few years will cover their utmost expenditure, and a number will rush into the business, and the result will be in the course of a few years—for our market is comparatively weak—that there would be an over-production, and there would be a compulsory selling of stock of every kind, the ruin of the manufacturers and the throwing aside of thousands of our laboring classes.

Why, sir, in the United States, at this moment, there is not more than one-

half of their manufactures in full operation. I read a list in Halifax last Friday night of 48 of the largest manufacturers in New England, one-third of which are paying no dividend and only working partial time, and the whole number of which have only averaged during the last financial year something like four per cent. upon their capital. We know in the iron districts there are over a hundred millions of capital invested, which is yielding no revenue at all; we know that the United States capitalists have so lost faith in the paying powers of the manufacturing interest that they have withdrawn their capital from it, and no better proof can be had of that than the fact that within the last twelve months the United States Government have been able to sell at par over a hundred millions of National four per cent. stock. This could not have been done a few years ago, and the depression which now exists in that country is now considerably intensified by the protection theory upon which the nation was pressed, and, at the same time, sir, we find that the United States Congress is rapidly awakening from the dream it had that the country was to enjoy for a long time a prosperous career, when they find in their cities and different towns thousands upon thousands of its working people are unable to get the bread that is necessary for their sustenance, thoroughly unable to get work and wandering in the lowest condition over the country, when they find that their foreign commerce has been swept away from them by free trade England, when they find that these insignificant Provinces are rapidly overhauling them in every commercial enterprise, they find it is time to make a turn, and it was only by a small minority that Mr. Woods' Reform Tariff Bill was lost during the last session. At a moment when the United States Government is rapidly reversing its steps and rapidly tending towards an era of commercial free trade it is gravely proposed to us by the leaders of the Opposition, in order solely to seat a politically bankrupt party in power, that we should adopt the retrogressive policy of the United States. (Cheers.) I might say, sir, that it is, after all, if we examined the utterances of various gentlemen, a policy of deception. We find that those who can make protection in the far West are not willing to make the same protection speeches in the far East. None of your Opposition orators will go to Western Ontario and advocate a duty on coal, but they find that an admirable weapon of offence against the Administration in Nova Scotia. You will find none of your Opposition orators in the West who do not advocate the imposition of a duty upon flour and grains in order to protect the Western farmer, but I have not heard since I have

been in the Eastern Provinces a single one of the Opposition people advocating a duty on flour and wheat in this quarter. And we find Dr. Tupper, a few days ago in Cape Breton, declaring that a duty on flour would be of no consequence, because it would not and could not raise the price of that article. Not raise the price of that article? Then why does he and others go to the Western farmers and induce them to give their votes to support a protective policy on the ground that it will benefit their interest? (Cheers.) Dr. Tupper with his usual ingenuity gave myself as an authority for a statement he made that no duty imposed on flour would raise its price in the East, and he is quite right in giving me as an authority for that statement so far as it went, but like Dr. Tupper he stopped short without finishing the quotation. (Cheers.) It is true I said it was impossible in the natural operation of the laws of trade that we could increase the price of any article of production of which the country produced a surplus. We have an ultimate market of trade across the Atlantic, and we have the means of transporting our produce to Liverpool or any other port just as cheaply as they can from New York, and whatever produce comes in at the west end of the country, beyond our own consumption, passes out at the east end, and is carried to Europe. But while that is true, it is also true that a duty on flour would as it did in former years increase the difficulties of trade on this coast, because many of your people here and in the United States have their natural trade connection with Boston and other United States cities, and we know that large flour and bread stuffs are carried along the coast partly as ballast, and to enable them to carry on a profitable article of trade in selling their fish and other produce of the Province, but while this is the case there can be no question that a duty on flour will either raise the price or not, and if we have too little grain for our own consumption, then they deliberately propose to tax the poor man's bread, and if we grow more than we can consume, they are advocating the same protection to the farmer of the West as they are making to the actual producer in the far East. But more than that, Mr. Tilley was a member of the Government which once imposed a tax on flour before, and a tax on other articles of produce and on coal, but after this tax was imposed it was so unpopular throughout this and all the Provinces that it was repealed by the House of Commons, and the Ministry themselves absolutely voted to murder their own infant. You have only to consult the Journals of the House, and you will see that at first when the motion was made there was an

attempt to maintain the duty, but the moment they found that the House was determined to repeal it, the love of office was more than the love of country, and they wheeled into line at once, and no man of the Opposition showed more alacrity in doing this than Mr. Tilley and his colleagues. But, now Sir, it seems we have all this re-enacted and the people of this country are appealed to to assist them in their determination. But I understand from the public newspapers that the policy was somewhat unpopular in St. John, and I understand that Mr. Boyd, who is the Accoucheur General to Mr. Tilley (Laughter) telegraphed to Sir John Macdonald to ask him if it was proposed to increase all the duties, and Sir John Macdonald, with a want of tact which amused me, for there appears to be very little attempt on his part to get round the corner as carefully as usual, at once telegraphed back that he had no intention to increase the duty but only to readjust the tariff. Now, sir, was it not his policy in the last session, and particularly did he not last session vote for protection on every motion made because he saw it was a step in the right direction, and he would get it by and bye if he took it piecemeal. But he speaks of a readjustment. What does the Opposition mean if it only means to readjust the duties from time to time as the necessities of commerce may point out? Every Ministry has to do that, and every tariff requires more or less revision in that sense in a few years. But if by the term readjustment it is meant to increase the duty upon every article manufactured in this Province, then I say that is the very essence of Protection, and it is that kind of protection which will be fatal to the true prosperity of this country. You have been told continually by the Opposition press that it was protection that gave England her predominance in manufactures and her dominion on the sea. Now sir, the reverse is the fact; why at the time Lord Melbourne succeeded to power England was reduced to the most absolute state of degradation in connection with her labor market that could be conceived, and you have only to read Lord Macaulay's Letters and Miss Martineau's and Aubrey's History of England to see this. With the corn laws in existence and the stagnation of her manufactures through this evil policy most of her population was living in a state of comparative starvation, and when Sir Robert Peel, met by the impulse of the nation, by the tremendous pressure which a united people can force upon any Government, he was compelled to yield; and at this moment there is not a statesman that can be named in England, either Tory or Whig, who would for a moment return to that state which brought ruin and desolation for a time upon the various parts of the

Motherland. (Hear, hear.) I will not take up any more of your time in dealing with this subject. It is quite true that protection of any class of people who are producing a thing in this country, will raise the value to the maker, and therefore it is equally true that it must raise the price to the consumer, and if we at present pay \$1.17½ for every dollar's worth of cotton goods that is bought in America or England, and if 10 cents more is imposed on it it will raise the price by 10 cents to the consumer, and until manufactories are built up in the country sufficient to cover the entire manufacture required of that article, this price must continue to be paid by every producer in the country; and so it is with every other article that can be named; and when any protectionist tries to convince you that he can at once protect certain interests and not increase the tax, he tells you what is a matter of proof, and it is almost an insult to the intelligence of the people to ask them to believe that the imposition of high duties does not mean higher prices. If it does not mean higher prices then it is no benefit to the manufacturer, and if it means higher prices it means not merely that but a gradual stoppage of revenue, and I believe it is utterly impossible to continue a system like that without bringing ruin upon the revenue, and upon the manufacturers ultimately, and immediate disaster upon the consumers. It is our duty to protect the great consuming class, to protect the mass of the population by beneficial legislation in so far as it means the interests of the greatest portion of our people—the greatest good to the greatest possible number. I say in addition to a sound commercial policy it is of great consequence at all times, and especially of great importance to a country in a time of depression that there should be an economical administration of public affairs. Now, sir, we have been accused in this respect by the Opposition candidates in this city and by Opposition men in other places, but I am bound to say that in reading the speeches of Mr. Tilley and Mr. King, especially the latter, that I have seen nothing at all that is original. (Cheers.) We have been accused, sir, of various matters in connection with the expenditure of the country, but I may by one general and sweeping statement dispose of the entire crop of statements in regard to our excessive expenditure. I have only to point out that the late government increased the expenditure of the country during their term of office from \$13,000,000 to \$23,000,000 in round numbers, while we have during five years of office, notwithstanding our having to meet obligations for interest and redemption of debt, and many other matters, which Mr. Cartwright will no doubt deal with, we

have notwithstanding having to meet all this to the extent of between \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000, practically kept the expenditure of the country stationary, so that if we are open to the charge of excessive expenditure of the public money, how much more are those gentlemen who with a less population, with less obligation, and without the great works we have had to carry out and provide for in conducting our railways and canals, how much more are they, I say, to blame who found it necessary six years ago to consume the same amount of money that is necessary for us to consume at the present time. I will, in the course of a few minutes, go into some items in order to shew you the direction in which the economy of the Government has taken effect. I have found that attempts have been made here and elsewhere to shew that for the large expenditure of 1873-4 we are responsible because we were in office seven or eight months out of the twelve, but you will all readily understand that the Finance Minister in power this year has to prepare the estimates, and he is responsible for those estimates, because he knows and must know that the money he asks for is required for public services; but a larger sum was required than was stated by Mr. Tilley. Let me give you one example. You are aware the late Government commenced a road from Fort William to Winnipeg, an ordinary macadamized road. The vote taken in 1873-4 was \$198,000, but before we assumed office, within the first four months of the financial year they had drawn by special warrant \$45,000 more than their estimate in the Spring of the year, and I found myself compelled to provide before the close of that calendar year the sum of \$145,000 more to pay outstanding liabilities, and we found that within the two years afterwards over \$60,000 of additional obligations had still to be paid; but assuming even that what was paid in the year 1873 we found Mr. Tilley's estimate for that service was as nearly as possible \$200,000 less than the amount which was required. In other words he asked \$198,000 and he spent \$400,000. I take another plan. In the spring of the year 1874 I had the same service advertised to be done by contract, and for two years we carried on the same service at an expense of \$76,000 per annum.

I desire to call your attention to another matter. Mr. Tilley on a recent occasion called your attention to a statement which he made respecting revenue and expenditure upon our public works, that is upon our Canals, Slides and Booms, and Railways, and he said the cost of maintenance and collecting the revenue from the Public Works for the years 1872-3-4 was \$4,345,684. The Revenue for the same period was \$4,038,279, and the annual average deficiency was \$102,468. Now he gave cor-

rectly the Revenue when he stated it at \$4,038,279, but he understated the expenditure for the year by a very large amount. Instead of \$4,345,684 the total expenditure for these 3 years was \$4,891,308.08, and instead of the average deficiency being \$102,468 it was \$284,000, and he stated the annual loss to be \$602,742 when it is \$605,745. But Mr. Tilley, with an ingenuity which would be very creditable in the legal firm of Quirk, Gammon and Snap, neglected to tell you of a very important matter, that is, the number of miles operated on the railway for each of these years. He assumed in his figures that it was possible to operate a thousand miles as easily as 253 miles. In the first year which Mr. Tilley takes, the number of miles open for the year was 294. In the second year it was 334 miles, and in his third year it was 371 miles. Now let us give you another different matter. In 1871-2 the expenditure was \$595,076.22, with 294 miles of railway open. I am giving the railways alone at this moment. In 1872-3 the expenditure was \$1,011,892.60, with 334 miles of road open. In 1873-4 it was \$1,847,925, with 371 miles open. These were the three years which Mr. Tilley took, and he instituted a comparison. In our first year we had 445 miles open, and our expenditure was \$1,581,934. In the second year our expenditure was \$1,497,123, and the mileage open for the year was 748. In 1876 we had an expenditure of \$1,890,168, with 944 miles open. Now, I should tell you further that the Railway in operation in Mr. Tilley's time was chiefly that between the two great cities of the Lower Provinces—St. John and Halifax, and that the mileage which we have opened is chiefly between Moncton and Riviere du Loup, which passes through a comparatively uninhabited country for at least one-half of its distance, where it would be absolutely impossible to operate the road as cheaply as between St. John and Halifax. But even with this disadvantage let me take the last year Mr. Tilley was in office. It cost the country in 1872-3, \$3,029.62 per mile to work the railway, and in his last year it took \$4,980.83 per mile, and during our three years it is as follows: our first year was \$3,554 per mile, with 445 miles open; our next year it was \$2,001.37, and in the last financial year, \$2,000.23; and taking their last three years and our last three years together their average per mile for working the road is \$3,344, while our average is \$2,518. Let me take another criterion still. You are aware that the true test of the cost of working a railway is the amount it cost per train mile. We run so many miles of trains, and every year there is a correct account kept of the train miles accomplished during that year. Well, sir, in this year it cost \$1.02 for every train mile upon the

road. In our last financial year it cost 82 cents per train mile. I will leave you to say whether you consider that statement of Mr. Tilley's was an ingenious one, and I leave you to decide who it is that has worked the road cheapest during that time.

Mr. Tilley adopted another method. He said in their time the Government worked the railways with an addition of only 14 per cent. to their actual revenue as the expenditure. He is incorrect even in that to some extent. He said it took 47 per cent. more than its income to work the road. Let me give you the income from year to year during the last 6 years, and you will see how the revenue declined as we accumulated unprofitable road. Besides the 375 miles north of Moncton, every mile of which is through an unpaying country, we have also the P. E. I. road to work a road which was partly built at first and which required considerable outlay on capital account, and is now an expensive road with a comparatively light traffic. We had 200 miles of that road to work in addition with an annual loss varying from \$60,000 to \$90,000; but our revenue during Mr. Tilley's last year was \$2,408 per mile, while in our first year it had declined as we began to open the northern road. We had then 445 miles against Mr. Tilley's 371 miles and our revenue declined to \$2,032 per mile. In the second year after we had the entire northern line opened, we had 748 miles in operation and the revenue declined again in consequence to \$1,331 per mile, and in the last financial year there was a slight increase of some \$30, the mileage being 944 miles, and the revenue \$1,361. The average earnings per mile was necessarily much higher during the year 1871 to 1873 and 1874 because it was chiefly between two cities and through a populous country. The revenue during these years averaged \$2,240, while during three years with the new and unproductive road it only averaged \$1,575. I am glad to say that the expenditure and the revenue is likely for the future to come somewhat more closely to a paying rate than what it has been for all time up to the present since it was opened. With regard to the other public works, Mr. Tilley has pointed out how much more prosperous they were in their expenditure than we. Let me read the expenditure during the years in question. You are aware that the depression which has overspread the country has necessarily decreased the revenue of all our public works as well as elsewhere. The revenue in 1871-2 on our Canal system was \$470,000. In '72-3 it was \$488,000. In '73-4 it reached the maximum of \$499,000. In '74-5, the first year of the depression, it had declined to \$432,000. In '75-6 \$380,000, and in '76-7 it began slowly to recover, having reached \$396,000.

Now let us see what the expenditure was during those years. In '71-2 it was \$318,000; in '72-3, \$367,000; in '73-4 it was \$412,000. This was the highest expenditure in the late Government. Now in our first year it was \$399,000, being \$13,000 less than their last year. In our second year it was \$396,000, and in our last financial year \$346,000, showing a steady decrease in expenditure over that period. I mention these facts to enable you to have an intelligent perception of the inaccuracy of the statements made by Mr. Tilley in regard to the revenue and expenditure on Public Works. I do not say that Mr. Tilley intentionally cooked his figures in order to show you how this can be made to appear to our disadvantage, but I do say that if he had tried to do it he could not have succeeded better. (Laughter). Of course I assume it was all an accident. Now, sir, there is another item of very great consequence in connection with our Public Works which will bear a few words. You are aware that during the last 6 years there has been very nearly 44 millions of public money's worth of contracts given out by the late and present Government. Sir John Macdonald, in 1876, at a time when recklessness of statement was commenced by the Opposition leaders, declared that during our own present Government it was impossible for any Conservative to get a contract, no matter whether he was the lowest or not, and if he was the lowest some hocus-pocus was resorted to to enable the Government to reach a friend of the Government, and to him the contract would be given. A statement so extraordinary at once challenged my attention, and within a few weeks I produced evidence at a public meeting, and I shewed that during their last 3 years of office they had given over 20 millions worth of contracts, and less than 7 millions of them, or about one-third, had reached the lowest tenderers; and I shewed that during our 3 years we had given a little over 19 millions worth of contracts, and 16 of them reached the lowest tenderers. Nay more, Sir, I adopted another plan. Up to my time it was the practice for the Minister of Public Works to open all tenders himself. In order to be thoroughly acquainted with even the names of tenderers I declined myself from the day I went into office to open any tender, and they were opened by the Chief Engineer or Deputy Minister, and then made out a list beginning with the lowest and a letter of the alphabet being put opposite to each one from the lowest to the highest. We begin at the lowest, and if he is able to furnish the security he is taken, and if not we pass on to the next.

Another system I adopted. I found there were a lot of speculative contractors

who would put in at a figure almost certain to be low and then endeavor to trade this off, and failing this to throw it up. I required a deposit to be made with every tender in every important work. Then the lowest was ascertained and he was communicated with and if he refused to go on with his tender he being the lowest, his deposit was forfeited. Let me mention one circumstance about this. Sir John Macdonald last session said he had no doubt, if the names of the parties who had forfeited deposits were looked at, they would be found to be Conservatives. Now, sir, there were four forfeits of \$1,000 each; three of them turned out political friends of my own, and one only a Conservative. After the tender would be let and the contract given, we required the contractor not to furnish the names of two of his neighbors from whom nothing could be collected, but an absolute deposit of cash bonds or securities of some kind that we could use for the purpose of indemnifying the Government in case of failure. I have a statement which shows that under the old system, some twenty-two or twenty-three contracts in the Intercolonial Railway have cost more than the sums for which they were originally let, in consequence of wanting security and the want of a proper system, and they have cost two and three-quarter millions more than the sum at which they were originally let. During my period of office I am informed by the officer of my department that all it has cost the Government over and above the price at which the contracts were originally let during those 4½ years is only \$5,552, thus showing an economical administration that has never been in operation before. Let me give you an illustration. A few months ago one of the contractors failed in his contract on the Lachine Canal. We had a deposit of cash of \$14,000. There was a percentage unpaid to him upon his contract. We found that there was \$20,000 owing to the workmen on the contract. Unless we had taken this protection these men would not have got a dollar of their wages and there would have been universal distress among them; but, sir, I was able, with the deposit in my hands, to see every man of them paid to the last farthing of his wages (cheers.), and have a balance over to indemnify the Government for the loss in reletting that contract. That would have been impossible under the old regime. I give this as an instance of what may be accomplished by a careful contract system.

As regards the Pacific Railway, the road from Fort William to Selkirk was 228 miles and nearly on all of it we have been able to build as good a road as the Intercolonial, with the exception of the bridges, they



being of wood instead of iron; and yet under our system it will only cost \$24,000, while the Intercolonial cost \$49,000 per mile. It may be said that the Intercolonial crosses the mouths of a great many rivers, but why does it cross the mouths of any rivers at all?

The hon. gentleman said that it was in order to gratify a political necessity and to meet a demand made by the majority against it that the favorable road down the valley of the St. John was sacrificed, and the result was not merely giving a longer road, but perhaps the most expensive road to be found upon the Continent. He saw that his name had been used in recent discussions, and Mr. Tilley had said he never intimated or brought forward any resolution in favor of the Southern road, and another gentleman stated that what he did say was in favor of the Northern road, but this was an old and exploded slander. In the debate on Confederation he said he was favorable to the Southern road because he had only the survey of Major Robinson, but after other surveys had been held he wanted the best route to the ocean, the one that would necessitate the least expense in building, and the one most profitable when it was built, and that was clearly down the Valley of the St. John. The hon. gentleman presumed he was violating no confidence in stating that when leading the Ontario Opposition he had interviews with two members of the late Government upon this subject, viz.: Mr. Tilley and Mr. MacDougall, who was an ardent advocate of the St. John Valley route, and who said that to adopt the Northern route would be to throw eight millions into the sea, and yet he himself was guilty of throwing that money into the sea. It was no secret that Sir John Macdonald, Mr. Tilley, Mr. Howland and Mr. Campbell were all in favor of the short and cheap route down the Valley of the St. John, and it was equally true that Sir Geo. Cartier had dominated the Cabinet and forced his opinion upon them all. These gentlemen and Mr. Tilley sent for him to his own house and asked him if he was prepared with the Ontario Opposition to back him up, and he had told them that he was and that almost the entire Ontario vote would support any Government or any motion for securing the most advantageous road. He had been attacked for not having exerted himself, but it was his duty as leader of the Opposition to take the course most consistent with public interests, and the people of Ontario were known to be in favor of the best, shortest and cheapest route to the ocean.

The hon. gentleman then said he had received a cordial invitation from one or two gentlemen in the audience to speak on the subject of steel rails. There was no sub-

ject he was more willing to speak upon, and he thought it was to be extremely regretted that Mr. Tilley should the other evening have acted so unworthily of himself as to insinuate that he or some of his relatives had an improper connection with this transaction. It was true he did not insinuate, but where there was a ground for suspicion, suspicions would be entertained, and how much more manly would it have been for Mr. Tilley to make a charge boldly. He had recently compelled two of his traducers in a court of law to apologise publicly for their slanders; and he would promise Mr. Tilley that if he would put his charges into such language as would be specific, he would give him an opportunity of doing so also. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Tilley, had stated the stock charge of the Opposition that he had made a contract with a firm of which his brother was a partner. The hon. gentleman then read from Mr. Tilley's Institute speech, as reported in the *Daily Sun*, as follows:—

"And now I came to the steel rail purchases of Mr. Mackenzie, I do not approve of calling political opponents 'thieves, who have inherited predatory instincts from their ancestors,' or 'a drunken crew, but propose to deal with public men as they ought to be dealt with. No man should lightly make a charge of dishonesty against a public man. In the purchase of steel rails that were not wanted Mr. Mackenzie committed a great error in judgment, and lost from one and a quarter to two millions by the transaction. When transactions of this kind are managed in such a way as to be open to suspicion, they will be suspected. I must say that the giving of only six days' notice for tenders for 50,000 tons of rails, necessarily excites suspicions, and these are increased by the connexion which Mr. Mackenzie's brother has with the firm that gets the contract. But I do not insinuate, of course, that there was anything wrong in the transaction. (Laughter and applause.) It was a great error in judgment, though, to buy on a falling market and without the authority of Parliament. It has been said that the late Government paid a higher price for rails, but that is not the question. What we want to know is; Was that the best time to buy? It was not the best. But there have been other losses besides the big price and the loss of interest. To find a place for some of the rails they were put on the Picton Railway, after it had been offered to a company, who therefore got \$235,000 additional value. Mr. Mackenzie did not manifest sound judgment, discretion or economy in this transaction, or in undertaking to build the Canada Pacific as a Government work, and I hope public opinion will force the Government before long to hand the road over to a company for completion."

I propose to deal first with the implied accusation, and I say that in the transaction there is no possible ground for such a suspicion, and no man knew it better than Mr. Tilley. He knew the rails were bought by public tender; Mr. Sandford Fleming had pressed him to get the rails over as soon as possible, and they all considered at the time that the market was then as low as it was likely to go, and no one could foresee the revolution in the price which succeeded in the course of a couple of years. It had been advertised in New York and Montreal papers with 6 and 9 days' notice, but after communica-

ting with two agents in Montreal, who wished to communicate with their principals, the time was enlarged to 6 weeks, and the tenders were regularly received towards the latter end of Nov. 1874, one half to be delivered in '75 and the other half in '76. They accepted the lowest tender, and the average price delivered in Montreal in \$54.60 the most favorable purchase that had ever been made up to that time in any country. Mr. Tilley had said his brother was interested in one of the firms that had a contract, but that firm, Cooper, Fairman & Co., were not contractors, but merely agents for the Mersey Steel Company, and as soon as these gentlemen had intimated their intention of acting as agents for a government contract, he of his own motion had withdrawn from the firm. He maintained that if he had been a member of a firm of contractors he had a perfect right to be, and no suspicion could possibly attach to him, unless Mr. Tilley was prepared to prove that the tenders were not fairly opened or fairly given. His brother had a perfect right to be a member of a firm of contractors, or still more to be a member of a firm which merely acted as agent for the contractors, but in point of fact he was neither one or the other. It is quite true his name was registered at Montreal as one of the firm at the time the tender was made, but it is also true as stated in Cooper, Fairman & Co's. letter, that he had retired from the firm, and it was the fault of his solicitor that his name was not off the register. (Cheers.) But in any case I maintain that the transaction was a perfectly fair one, and no blame can be attached to the Government, my brother, or myself. But it was said by Mr. Tilley that some of these rails were laid on the Pictou Branch, which line was to be handed over to a firm of contractors for building the Eastern Extension. You will laugh when you hear the names of the contractors so favored—and at the idea that the Government had any motive for favoring them. Sir Hugh Allan was the president, and J. G. Abbott, who sent along the other ten thousand, and his brother were the rest of the company so favored by us. Yet Mr. Tilley accuses me of laying these rails on the Pictou road. He ought to know that the greater part of the Pictou road was not laid with steel rails at all. He ought to know that only 37 miles were so laid, and of that only 15 miles were laid after the delivery of steel rails in any part of Canada—of this importation one ship-load went to this road—and it shows how careless Mr. Tilley is in his statements. In the first place I had no motive whatever to lay steel rails except for the purpose of putting the road in a position to enable it to carry on the ordinary traffic, and in the second place

we had laid no steel rails where we could possibly avoid it—and there are now 13½ miles of this road which are in a poor condition for want of rails—now, sir, Mr. Tilley in his speech referred to a number of matters in connection with the Canada Pacific Railway, and attacks our policy in connection with it. My policy was laid down in Parliament, as may be found by reference to the Hansard. I opposed the extravagant bargain made by the late Government with British Columbia, and assuming that Mr. Tilley statement that I bought the steel rails too soon to be true, (which I utterly deny) because afterwards there happened to be a reduction in price, this is not to be attributed to our extravagance, but more to causes affecting the market. Now, sir, I will say that when Mr. Tilley said, as he did, that we had spent \$10,000,000 and had scarcely a mile of road laid, he was acting on information wholly inaccurate. I state this in his presence—giving him the liberty to correct the error into which he has fallen. At present we have 228 miles of the main line nearly completed, and we have also the 88 miles of the Pembina Branch nearly finished—and before the end of the year we expect to have 302 miles laid on the Pacific Railway, and on that road will be laid more than one half of the steel rails purchased by us—and very nearly 4000 tons of these rails will be laid on this road and the Intercolonial before the end of this present year. I say that our policy respecting the Pacific Railway was one forced upon us by the late Government: they had entered into an engagement to build 2600 miles of railway within ten years, in an unexplored section of the country. I say that this is one of the greatest acts of mal-administration that can be conceived, and I don't see how any Government could undertake such an obligation. It has cost us in surveys alone about \$3,056,000, and the work has now only begun. Our policy now is that we will go on with the work as far as we can without increasing the burthen of taxation, but we will not bring the whole country into financial ruin by completing the contract with British Columbia unless the time is extended—but if they give us the time we hope in the end to say that we will be able to accomplish it—I proposed in 1874 to build the road either by contract or under the provisions of an act which provided for a certain fixed amount per mile, we propose to ask tenders for the building of the whole road under the act, at \$10,000 and 50,000 acres of land per mile. If we receive such tenders well and good—but if we do not we must then consider what is our next best course. I believe in keeping faith

where it can be kept—and what do we find the Opposition doing?—We find Sir J. A. Macdonald in their great organ, the *Toronto Mail*, declaring that if the people of British Columbia do not support the opposition they will forfeit all claim on the Conservative Party in getting the road built at all. Mr. Tilley said that if we did not allow them this Railway when they came into Confederation we would have had to allow them \$30,000,000 of debt. Think of it, \$30,000,000 of debt to a county whose population consists of 10,000 whites and 40,000 Indians. Mr. Tilley here informs me that he has been misreported. Well I will give him the benefit of the correction, I am afraid it will not help him much. He said that when we got 1,000,000 in the North West there would be 30,000,000 of debt. He said he would give five millions more and have the work done, but let him state to night what was Sir Hugh Allen's report when he came back from England, and show if he got any support there. [Here there was an interruption and calls of "time"] Gentlemen who call time must understand I must take my own time. I have come here for the purpose of speaking upon these questions, and I have yielded three-quarters of my time already to gratify the friends of Mr. Tilley and Mr. King, and I say emphatically that it is no use of asking me to stop or to attempt to put me down until I am ready. (Loud cheers.)

Now, sir, with regard to Mr. Tilley, he has a peculiar faculty in reading figures to suit himself both ways. He accuses me of having lost a large amount of money in the purchase of the steel rails for the Pacific Railway, and yet he assures us that only a small sum additional is necessary to get us out of the scrape. He says we have lost a million and a half in the purchase of these rails. We might have sufficed with eight or ten tons less—but we will contrast our purchases with some made under his administration. (Further cries for "Tilley.") Now I will speak as long as I like if I have to stand here till daylight. If the Conservatives intend to pursue the same tactics here that they did at Charlottetown and Toronto they will find it to their disadvantage. I am not to be put down, and I wish that distinctly understood. At the time that we were buying these rails at \$54 a ton we were receiving rails bought by them without any tender at \$85 a ton, and on these rails they were also paying a broker in London a heavy commission, and this broker cheated the Government by some £8 or £10 per ton. Since we went into power we have entered proceedings against the broker, and we have recovered a judgment against the broker, and there is £10,000 yet to come, but I presume we were cheated in the execution. These are the facts connected with the steel

rails with both administrations. I don't insinuate anything against Mr. Tilley in saying what I do, but I do say that he made a most improvident purchase when he bought for \$85 rails which we bought for \$54. Now let me deal with one or two of what are called the recent scandals. Mr. King has grown eloquent over what he calls the Kaministiquia Job and Canada Central matter, and he says that we have made more scandals in five years than even the old Government ever did. I do not know Mr. King particularly, but I look upon him as a sort of mental and moral phenomenon—and I say he has a most wonderful vision when he can see only one side of the picture, but can't look upon the other; but surely he cannot be ignorant of the Pacific Scandal and some other matters to which I will allude. Now, with regard to this Kaministiquia job, Sandford Fleming located the railway on the Kaministiquia river, and I agreed with him when he selected the terminus, for I knew the locality, and when he selected the town plot at Fort William he selected the only place on the river fit for the terminus. But it had been surveyed as a town plot some fifteen years before, by the Tilley Government, not by us. We kept the terminus secret, but as soon as it became known where the terminus would be the property acquired an increased value and began to change hands rapidly. Well, what did we do? We appointed two valuers to ascertain the value of the lands; and who were they? One was Mr. Hugh Wilson, a surveyor who knew all about the value of the lands there, and who moreover was a staunch Conservative, and the other was a well known merchant of London, Ontario. They said the value of the 100 acres was \$50,000, and it said they gave too much for one lot on which stood the Necbin Hotel. If they did overvalue the land what is that to us? We took the only legal course we had by law of appraising the value of the land. But if King means to insinuate that I or my political friends were in any way interested in the matter, I say this is a foul calumny. One newspaper did dare to say so, and after I brought it into Court and it had sent agents to the spot to see if it could substantiate its charges it was glad to get off by publishing an apology. During the time I had been in power I have made it a rule always to decline to have anything to do with the purchase of lands for the Government, and I think this is the only safe way. And now what is there wrong with regard to the Central Railway? They say that Mr. Foster received \$109,000, to which he was not entitled. We did pay a sum of about \$68,000, and when we found that Foster was unable to go on with the job we took it off his hands. \$4,000 were paid on the

proper vouchers being given, and this with the \$68,000 made up the \$109,000. His section of the Railway cost the country \$894 per mile, while the rest cost \$1,400, and you will see that there was nothing paid which was not right. But I ask who are the men who are thus assailing us? I defy the entire lot of Conservative candidates or their friends to point to a single circumstance where the Government has misappropriated the people's money. Let me refer to a transaction in which Mr. Tilley took a leading part. I refer to the Northern Railway. You will remember that the late Province of Canada lent to this Railway a large sum of money, and the Railway was anxious to get rid of the Government lien, and Mr. Tilley, or at least I think it was he, introduced a resolution into the House to accept \$500,000 in lieu of that lien. The then Deputy Minister of Justice was the Solicitor of that Railway. We refused to agree to the measure, and they did not dare to bring it before the House. After I came into power I investigated the matter, and I found out the secret why the Government were so lenient. We found one member sitting in the House after having received money from the Company which belonged to the Government. We found that the Company had advanced money to assist the member for Toronto West in gaining his election, had assisted Sir Francis Hincks in gaining his election, had contributed to a testimonial to another of Mr. Tilley's colleagues, and has \$1,500 worth of stock in the paper which was the organ of the party. I refused to take less than a million dollars, and I got it (great applause), and we made the Company disgorge in addition other money which they illegally got. Messrs. Tilley and King had better devote a little time to the explanation of these matters if they can.

Now then I come to the secret service fund. As Mr. Tilley had said that where ground for suspicion existed, there suspicion was sure to be entertained, I will take him as my authority. What do we find? We find that the late Government voted themselves nearly \$200,000 for the secret service fund to be used in repelling the Fenians, so they said, but a great number of Fenians appeared after the last raid, in fact the danger extended till after the general election of 1872. We determined we should have this fund audited. Sir John said when I stated in a speech that this was the English practice that I knew it was not. I knew it was—and I cite May's Parliamentary Practice, and Todd's Parliamentary Practice in support of my position. Well, I found three years after that nearly \$32,000 of this fund was deposited in a Bank in Canada, in whose name do you suppose? Why, in the name of four Ministers, and Sir John, after he ceased to be a Minister, drew a cheque

on this bank for \$6,000, which the bank paid. I say the bank should not have honored the cheque. I say that there is nothing more opposed to sound constitutional practice than for a man who has ceased to be a Minister to have control over the public moneys, and we have taken proceedings against the bank to compel them to pay back that money thus illegally paid. Let Mr. Tilley explain this if he can. (Applause.) Again we are accused of increasing the expenditures. Let us look at their acts. Take for example the Contingencies Account—which means paper, postages, &c. In the last year of their administration this account was \$222,000; with us it decreased, until in our last year it was only \$128,000. But that is not all. With regard to one of the items in this account which I discovered not by the published statements, but the examination of vouchers, I find that one year they spent a sum of \$1,200 to publish the portraits of Mr. Tilley and his colleagues. Now I certainly could not have the temptation to do this, for I certainly am not the handsome man Mr. Tilley is—(laughter)—but if they were ever so good looking they ought not to use the public money to publish their own portraits. Then there is another item of \$2,500 given out of this fund by Sir John to a friend to be repaid in printing, but that money has not been repaid, and it is lost, illustrating the mode in which the Government was conducted at that time. (Applause.)

Mr. King has said that it is not a fair method to build up a reputation for ourselves upon the evil deeds of our predecessors. I give his idea, not his language. I would be very sorry for a moment to give way to the thought occasioned by such a statement, but if gentlemen are trying to supersede us, who have the offices already distributed, it is but fair, I think, to enquire into their reputations, and to see what qualifications they possess. I will, therefore, now deal with some statements made by them: and first, that story about Mr. Tilley's acceptance of the Governorship. Mr. Tilley's statement in this matter is as follows:

"I now say solemnly that I never entered the House of Commons and never sat there for a moment after I had decided to accept the position of Lieutenant Governor. I arrived at Halifax on the 19th October, 1873, from England and started for Ottawa. At Truro I received a telegram from Sir John A. Macdonald. I arrived at Ottawa on Thursday afternoon, October 23rd, and went at once to meet my colleagues in the Government, whom I found in the Council Chamber. One of my colleagues said to me: 'We came very near making you a Lieutenant Governor in your absence.' I said to him, 'How was that?' He explained that certain circumstances had arisen which seemed to render such a step desirable. I replied, 'Well, these circumstances have ceased to exist, and now I have not the most remote idea of accepting it.'

On Friday, the day after my return to Ottawa, I met the Governor General in his office and said to him, 'I hear you came very near making me a

Lieutenant Governor in my absence." He said yes, and then I replied that under present circumstances I could not think of accepting the office. The matter never was mentioned again to me or by me until the morning after Sir John A. Macdonald announced to Parliament that he intended to resign, and it was three days before that that I said in Parliament I would go down with my colleagues. The day after he made that announcement Sir John said to me that he would make the appointment, and so far from my sitting in Parliament with the commission in my pocket, I declare most solemnly that the matter was never broached to me until the morning after Sir John announced his intention to resign."

Parliament had met at the time, and there was a motion of want of confidence against the Government, and on the evening of Nov. 6, Mr. Tilley, who was leading the House in the absence of his chief, appealed to me for an adjournment, on the plea that there was yet a number of members to speak. I accepted this statement in good faith, and we adjourned, and the next morning the Macdonald Government resigned. That very day Mr. Tilley's commission was made out, but the order in council had been made on the 20th October and confirmed on the 21st, and I say that Mr. Tilley had no right to sit in that House after he had been appointed Governor. I say so now, and it is his business to state what the changed circumstances were. On our accession to office we cancelled some 100 of the appointments which our predecessors had made just before they went out of power, but we did not deem it advisable to deal in the same way with so high an office as the Governorship of the Province of New Brunswick.

I now propose, for a few minutes only, for the strain of speaking in this building is very hard on my voice, to deal with some other statements made by some parties in this city. I see it stated in the papers that Mr. John Boyd, who has distinguished himself as a wit, and whose imagination is as futile as his wit, has said that the Post Office was burned down for want of an illuminated clock, that I could scatter illuminated clocks all over Ontario, but when St. John asked for one I said, "Nae, nae, naething of the kind," and then he adds that that hole that that clock would have stopped caused the building to burn down. (Laughter.) Now, the only serious reason on which that clock was refused was that it caused a great danger of fire. There is not that I am aware a single clock illuminated or otherwise on any Custom House in Ontario. It is too bad that a man of Mr. Boyd's wit should be poking fun at a meeting in that way. (A voice, "You have gone long enough.") No doubt I have for you. (Interruptions and cries for "Tilley.") I tell the gentlemen who are making the noise that I will not be put down. Mr. King makes the statement that when he went to the old Government he always got a civil hearing, but that when he

went to Mackenzie he was insulted. I don't know when I insulted Mr. King. I am certain I did not. I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. King but once or twice, and I would hardly know him on the street, and I am positive I did not insult him in any way. But, says Mr. King, you have dealt unfairly by us in the Penitentiary matter. The Government of New Brunswick made some claims in connection with the Penitentiaries and other matters, and they will be dealt with by us in accordance with the justness of the claims. He says the old Government always settled our claims handsomely. Why the old Government had these very claims for settlement and he may thank them for any injustice done. (Applause.) He further says I always opposed the \$150,000 to New Brunswick in lieu of the export duties. If you read my speeches you will find that I always pointed out that the export duty never exceeded \$60,000 a year, and that the real point was to increase the subsidy to N. B. I was willing to give the \$150,000, but all I wished to do was simply to show that I understood what the real object was, and I stated at the same time that I did not oppose the motion (cheers). Does Mr. King think that he will make himself strong by such misrepresentations as these. I am not conscious that I ever showed any hostility to any part of the Dominion, and certainly if any place was treated fairly it was the City and County of St. John. The only costly work of defence which we have undertaken has been to defend the harbor of this city—when we came in we found the work on the proper terminus for freight was not being proceeded with, and we went on with the work—(cheers.) Mr. Boyd says we sent only \$20,000 to your relief at your great fire. This was the money of the Dominion of Canada, and there were fires in St. Hyacinthe and St. Johns, Quebec, equally as disastrous to the people of those places as yours was to you, and yet we did not contribute anything to their relief. We have been accused of dilatoriness in proceeding with the public buildings here, but we have to proceed carefully in such matters, and it is only lately that we have been able to settle the contracts—we would like to get along faster, but we are getting along as fast as possible—(cries for "Tilley")—I can assure you I am as anxious to close as you are—I ask you, in conclusion, to remember that come what may, I am determined to allow no slanderous tongues to assail my character with impunity—(great cheering). As to your representative, the Minister of Customs, who has been my colleague in the Government for the past four years, I may say that I can bear cheerful testimony to his great industry and ability, and it would be well for those who under-rate him if they possessed his administrative capacity—(great cheers.) Of Mr. De-



Veber I must say that I always found him a most painstaking and careful representative, constant in his attendance upon his public duties, and one who is looked upon with the utmost favor by those whom he meets in Parliament (cheers.) Both these gentlemen and their associate Mr. Weldon, are well fitted to give you a true and worthy representation in the next Parliament (cheers). The large gathering here to-night show the great interest which you feel in the questions to be decided in the coming elections—and when you come to return your verdict I hope you will exclude those who have so greatly abused their power when they had it, and if I shall again be entrusted with the administration of affairs, I assure you I will discharge my duty to the best of my ability and with integrity. I am indebted to the people of the Maritime Provinces for the support they have hitherto given my government: and I hope they will continue this support. There is not a man in the Government who feels a greater interest in the Maritime Provinces than my colleague who is to address you this evening. He was associated with me before forming the Government, and he then gave his support to the measures we advocated, and which we have since carried. It has been said we are a coalition Government. There is not a colleague associated with me, who had not been for

some time associated with me in the Opposition. It is true I object to coalitions, and I call it a coalition when the policy of one party is surrendered in order to be associated with another party. We have endeavored to carry on the Government of the country for the best interests of the country—we passed the election law, which is a credit to any country, and we have moreover repealed some fifty or sixty of the acts passed by Sir John's party. As for the Supreme Court Act, I have to say that they introduced the measure several times, and after we passed it, Sir John took the credit of it. They did not pass it because they could not—with regard to the Election Law which they passed, they gave the Government power to appoint valuers to assess the property on which the rating was to be done. This last law which we have passed is so framed as to enable the people to go to the polls without any fear of intimidation—and its good effects have been seen in the late elections in other parts of Canada.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the people of St. John for the patience with which you have heard me—I shall always remember it—and whether I meet with you again as a member of the Government or not, I hope that our relations will always be of a friendly nature.

## HON. MR. CARTWRIGHT'S SPEECH.

Hon. Mr. Cartwright on rising said—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen :—coming among you as I do, a stranger comparatively alone, I have to thank Mr. King above all others for making me feel welcome among the citizens of St. John. While listening to the speech of that gentleman I merely had to close my eyes as though asleep and could imagine myself at home discussing item by item the estimates at 2 o'clock in the morning in Parliament—when Dr. Tupper was speaking against time before the house. There is as much in Mr. King's oration as in that style adopted by our friend Peter Mitchell when bewailing the sad fate of Mrs. Murphy's cow—an animal which has already cost the Dominion of Canada over \$32,000, if you take the value of time spent over it, and still there is no end of the matter. Therefore, I can sympathise with your patience. I think it would have been wiser for Messrs. King and Tilley not to have taken this opportunity, but to have taken the time all to themselves at some other period; but it is their proposition and not ours. Mr. King no doubt is a clever lawyer, but I cannot give him that credit which he may think is due to him as a quoter of

scriptural illustrations. He should have said in quoting that great monster, that Goliath was so over protected that unprotected David smote him, and the great monster fell a victim to the noble youth, with all his bravery of arms and all the iron and brass in which he was encased. (Great applause),—an illustration peculiarly unhappy to Mr. King and his party. (Great cheers). Taking his war of the "Killkenny cats," let me tell you that it is nothing to the war between these parties; in that there was nothing left but the tails, in this there will be nothing left. (Great cheers). Mr. King said he was likened unto a grain placed between the upper and nether mill-stones. For my part I think if Mr. King was to be ground that more chaff than grain would be the result of the process. (Long and continued cheering and laughter). I don't intend to say much about Mr. King's speech, as I think every point made by that gentleman has been fully answered by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and myself both in the published speeches and here to-night. Mr. Mackenzie and myself have a right to be heard and to speak to the citizens of St. John in defence of our course which has been gross-

in the Op-  
coalitions,  
the policy  
order to be  
r. We have  
government of  
interests of the  
law, which  
and we have  
or sixty of  
party. As  
have to say  
insure several  
Sir John took  
not pass it be-  
regard to the  
they passed,  
power to  
done. This  
is so framed  
to the polis-  
ion—and its  
in the late  
ada,  
and the peo-  
e with which  
always re-  
et with you  
overnment or  
will always

CH.

should have  
monster, that  
that unpro-  
d the great  
oble youth,  
and all the  
as encased.  
ation pecu-  
l his party.  
is war of  
me tell you  
ar between  
was nothing  
will be no-  
R. King said  
ced between  
s. For my  
be ground  
uld be the  
d continued  
t intend to  
peech, as I  
gentleman  
Hon. Mr.  
he publish-  
Mr. Mac-  
to be heard  
St. John in  
been gross-

ly attacked by the Opposition party. Mr. Tilley and Mr. King are in the midst of their own constituency, and have the people to meet with every week.

There are two points of surpassing interest upon which the questions of the coming election should be based. The first is, what is the best trade policy for Canada to adopt while this great depression of trade is spreading itself over almost all parts of the globe, in order to give the country prosperity, and enable the working man to make both ends meet out to him an honest and comfortable living for his family? (Applause.) The other is of almost equal merit—who shall practically be your rulers for the next five years? I have little or no sympathy with those who tell you that it makes but little difference who shall rule you, and that one set of men are as good as another. Now, who are the men you have trusted for and during the period of four or five years to an office of high trust? My hon. friend and myself. Now, sir, as to the first point, our policy has been fully declared time and again. We have set our faces against that very foolish doctrine that a short cut to riches was to double and treble the taxes of this country, to give the Government prosperity by taxing the poor man. We have, as well as others, studied the policy of the United States. We don't want to imitate the folly of theirs there. We see by their ablest men that that foolish policy had caused their capital to be wasted, their commerce to be annihilated and all the evils that have been brought about upon the people of that country. We have no desire to bring such evil upon our own welfare, upon the people over whom we may be called upon to rule, and for whom we are responsible. No doubt you have in St. John many able men to instruct you on all these questions, therefore I will not touch upon them any further. My task is rendered necessary, but to some degree unpleasant, by the course pursued by Mr. Tilley. In a speech on a former occasion you will note that Mr. Tilley has attacked us on all points; he has criticised our financial administration from point to point; he has taken upon himself to dispute the correctness of our mode of keeping the public accounts, and has treated very unfairly the Minister and myself. Now, sir, I propose looking into the course he pursued when in power. I have been of the opinion that if we erred at all, it was because of having dealt too leniently with Mr. Tilley in his political character. As a man of ability and in his private capacity, we entertain all due respect for Mr. Tilley; but we cannot extend all those to him as Mr. Tilley, the Minister, (Hear, hear.) I say he has been leniently dealt with by us, partly on account of our respect for him

as a man, and partly because he was in a position in which he could not answer us; and moreover we desired to draw a distinction between him and his other colleagues who only seemed to have escaped punishment to glory in their own shame. We entertained a liking and regard for Mr. Tilley, as a man whose errors are to be attributed to his head rather than to his heart. But he has openly defied us. He wanted to know what we complained of in his conduct. He has not been content to remain in the obscurity to which we had consigned him. He has challenged us to criticize his administration of the finances, and he must not complain if I proceed to show you what errors he committed when he was responsible for the conduct of the office that I now hold. What was the position of affairs when we came into office? We find our expenditures had increased from \$13,500,000 to \$23,500,000, and we find more than that behind, for we find the Dominion was committed to all sorts of indefinite liabilities. He did not appreciate the position because he had not studied it out. It was certain that there would be a considerable deficit, and the only way to avert it was by a heavy taxation. Not only did the late Government run up the expenditure to the figures I have named, but from Mr. Tilley's own statement in his budget speech in 1873, he expected to add to the public expenditure after 1873 no less a sum than \$3,367,000 for interest and sinking fund alone. I think we have a right to complain of the state in which we find the public finances. But that is not all. We find that Mr. Tilley has under-estimated our liabilities. So far from being but \$60,000,000, which he said they were, if they had been carried out according to the estimates which he brought down they would have been \$96,000,000, which would have involved a further charge of \$5,000,000 for interest alone, besides a variety of other charges, making \$1,200,000 additional. Now, for a Government that had raised our expenditures as I have shown, and had left us liable for heavy liabilities by entering into heavy engagements, to pretend that they had left nothing behind for their successors to quail at, is to trifle with the meaning of words, and I say they should not continue to trifle with figures which are on record on the books of Parliament. If the Finance Minister of 1878 has a deficit, it is because the Finance Minister of 1873 violated every rule of common sense and common prudence, and acted contrary to all rules which should guide a Finance Minister in managing the financial affairs of the country. (Cheers.) But I must now recapitulate the several blunders of Mr. Tilley's administration; first, because he has chal-

lenged me to do so; and secondly, you must understand thoroughly what they are in order to understand the financial standing of to-day. Now I think that these blunders are as follows,—First, in making such terms as he did with British Columbia; secondly, in mistaking the temporary inflation which preceded the years 1873 and 1874 for permanent prosperity. Third, the assumption of the Provincial debts; the admission of provinces, and the undertaking of the heavy public works he did. And lastly his negligence in not providing by taxation for the deficit which his own measures entailed. I suppose Mr. Tilley might set up the plea of "limited liability" in that he was only one of five; and if he set up such a plea I am disposed to admit it. But being the Finance Minister he ought certainly to have guarded his colleagues in the Government from falling into the particular errors which I have pointed out. The bargain with British Columbia was a gross error in judgment, and for this error, one so great that members of Government have retired from the Government for less causes, Mr. Tilley as Finance Minister is chiefly responsible. And as to the mistake in reference to the inflation preceding 1873, I admit that this was also an error in judgment, and one in which others besides Mr. Tilley had fallen. But remember that Mr. Tilley and his friends were then old and experienced statesmen, and they had been warned again and again about this, and I say this was a grave error in judgment. Having been many years Minister of Customs he knew from the previous history of our trade that a period of depression was to be expected, and he should have provided for it. But Mr. Tilley had no fears, and he took occasion, after having pointed out the amount he thought would be necessary to carry out the projects which he contemplated, to picture what would be the future history of our country after the Pacific Railway had been completed. He saw as in a vision our great Northwest colonized and pouring money into our treasury, and Ontario doubling and trebling its trade. But he seemed to have an idea that it might be possible his vision might not be fulfilled. He said that suppose our population should not increase beyond that of the last ten years, and that our trade should only increase in the same ratio, a proposition barely supposable, our importations then stood at \$128,000,000, and that would give us but little trouble in bearing the additional burthens which he desired to impose on this country. I refer, and I hope the press of St. John will refer you to Mr. Tilley's own budget speech just before he left office. I then called his attention to the errors underlying his calculations. I showed what our imports were previous to 1854; that

from 1854 to 1866 the imports were almost stationary; while from the last three years they had increased from \$74,000,000 to \$128,000,000, at which sum they were in 1873, and that it would not be wise to reckon on any lengthened period of prosperity, such as we were then enjoying. But Mr. Tilley, having a majority at his command in the House, disregarded the warnings we gave him, and to-day you see the fatal results of his unhappy mistake. (Cheers.)

Now we come to the question of the assumption of the financial debts. It is admitted that it is a fair question for argument if at that time we could have afforded to have taken the debt upon our own shoulders. I hold it was a very unwise course under any circumstances, for it relieved the Provinces from all restraints; and I contend that the Province of Quebec to-day is much worse off than it would have been, had not that been put upon the statute book. But I say it is an entire delusion to suppose that you gain anything by giving the provinces of the Dominion power to expend larger sums of money than they were able to do before. You in New Brunswick, who are taxed more per head than in the other Provinces, can easily see, and my friend Mr. Burpee will show you how you would lose on that operation. On the contrary you pay more in additional taxation than you gain by the assumption of the debt. But while I am on the point I may take the occasion to call your attention to a misrepresentation of a speech I made, in which it was said that I was opposed to the payment to New Brunswick of the \$150,000 in lieu of the export duty. But it is not true. I stated I was opposed to the assumption of the Provincial debts; and it was by suppressing part of a sentence that I was made to appear to oppose the subsidy. I hold that the cost of paying this \$150,000 to New Brunswick will equal the amount received by the country from the Treaty of Washington, after deducting the share that Newfoundland will have to receive. Now, then, as to the question of the admission of Prince Edward Island. Under the terms made we now pay to the Island the sum of \$820,000 per year, while we receive from the Island in revenue about \$420,000—which means a dead loss to the country of \$400,000 a year, or \$4 a year for every man, woman and child in the Island. The people there were right in making the best bargain they could, and in getting what they could when coming into the union, but I leave it to Mr. Tilley and his colleagues to explain what the state of the country must have been when the people of the Island said that unless you pay us cent for cent for every

cent we put into the treasury we will not come in. If those items were all correct I take objection, sir, to the extreme folly of undertaking all these enterprises at once. We had at the time on hand canals and railways all through the Dominion, and we should not have incurred further expense, any more than a merchant would in time of depression increase his expenses of living and carrying on his business, unless he felt the ground sure beneath his feet—and it was at this time, too, that the Minister of Finance was obliged to go to London to negotiate a large loan for the Dominion, and the trouble of negotiating these loans would be increased by these very circumstances. Out of these loans which I have negotiated, amounting in all to about \$43,000,000, fully one-half has gone to pay the debts thus contracted by Mr. Tilley and his colleagues. I have passed very lightly, probably too lightly, over this.

I now come to the last of the charges against Mr. Tilley—that he made no provision for the deficit that he must have expected. He submitted a statement to Parliament in which he estimated the expenditures at \$20,940,000, and the receipts at \$21,740,000, showing a surplus of about \$800,000. But when he submitted this to the House did he not know there was a project on foot to assume the debts of the different provinces, to admit Prince Edward Island to the Union, to increase the salaries of the Civil Service, and to organize an expensive mounted police force in the North-west Territories, which would add largely to the expenditure. He must have known this and the House should have been put in possession of the facts. On this point I would like an answer from Mr. Tilley. I say that under these circumstances, the budget speech was a most deceptive one, and had the House been in possession of the facts the budget would not have passed without a fierce struggle. I say that, as to the assumption of the debts, the House was treated shamefully. What, sir, do these charges involve? Why, we were about to add to our expenditures, permanently, \$2,270,000 a year, from which we were to derive but a revenue of \$420,000 a year, and the inevitable result was that we must have a deficit. (Mr. Cartwright here read from page 156 of the *Pic-nic Speeches* to show that Mr. Tilley got or took authority in 1873-74 for the expenditure of \$23,685,000, leaving out altogether the weights and measures and some other items.) Mr. Tilley justified himself in not touching the tariff on the ground that he had a surplus revenue, and he accuses me of undue haste in touching the tariff, and I might say with truth that the people were placed in such a position that I was obliged to

undertake the task that he was not able to take himself, and I may sympathize with the patience of you here for Mr. Tilley's benevolence. He is exercised that we imposed a duty on teas and made it specific, and he speaks of the injustice done the poor man. I might remind him that in England there is a specific duty on tea, and his own Government imposed a specific duty on tea in addition to the *ad valorem* duty. Last year the duty collected amounted to \$600,000, which would be a duty of 15 cents per head on all the inhabitants of the Dominion, and the amount of injustice done to the poorer people would be equal to 1-24th part of 15 cents, which would be less than the lowest coin issued in Canada. Mr. Tilley charges us with closing the sugar refineries. The only alteration we made was the reduction of Tilley's tariff on the coarser grades of sugar, and I am surprised to find him, a temperance man as he is, condemning because we taxed the poor man's rum more than the rich man's wine. I did not expect to find him advocating cheap rum and dear flour. What a fall from grace, and it shows that you ought carefully to preserve him from further contamination by carefully keeping him at home. (Cheers and laughter.) Next is the question of the tax on ships' materials, as it is only about \$27,000 and does not affect ship building at all. Now, with regard to those loans of mine which Mr. Tilley has so severely criticised, I refer you to Sir Francis Hincks, who was certainly no friend of mine, and certainly had no reason to favor any transaction of mine. You will find my defence in the pages of *Hansard* and in my budget speech. I have, however, a word of comparison to make between Mr. Tilley's loan and my loan in 1875. Mr. Tilley went to England to negotiate a loan, one half of which had been negotiated by Sir John Rose in 1868. The negotiation of an imperial guarantee 4 per cent. loan is a very easy transaction. Sir John Rose had, however, negotiated a mixed loan, and he had the five per cent. at 90, being the full market value, and the 4 per cent. at 110. Mr. Tilley negotiated his at 104, and it was at a time when Canada was in a much better position than it was when Sir John Rose floated his loan. Circumstances may have been against Mr. Tilley, but whether it was ill-luck or mismanagement, it is certain that he got £6 less in 1873 than was got in 1868 under less favorable circumstances, and Mr. Tilley will do well to explain why he did not do better.

There has been a good deal of capital made out of the amendment I moved in reference to the route of the Intercolonial Railway. It is true I did carry the resolution by an overwhelming majority, that it was inexpedient to open up the northern route. The question was a debatable one, but I held that the House was not



sufficiently informed on the subject. You will find that one great argument used by the late Government, in favor of the northern route, was that the Imperial Government would not, for military reasons, give them a guarantee to the undertaking unless the northern route was adopted. This statement was made, and if the Imperial Government did say so, I believe they received their inspiration from this side of the water. I would call your attention to the fact that a native of Ontario, and not familiar with these routes, as a matter of course, I would not know what route was best; but what is to be said of your member living here and knowing all about the routes, who thought his situation or seat in the Cabinet of far more importance than the interests of your constituency, and he did not choose, as did Mr. Peter Mitchell, to make the adoption of such a route as would have been to the best interest of this constituency of such importance as to resign his seat in the Cabinet if such a route were not adopted. (Great cheers.)

I had thought that when Mr. Tilley came forward again into public life he would express himself upon transactions that he was familiar with, but I am afraid that he has in his vice-regal situation fallen from grace. I find, however, that he has learnt nothing and forgotten nothing. I had hoped that he would be ready to express his condemnation of the scandals which have come to light. It may be he finds it impossible to express his real sentiments, but he owes it to his constituents to state what those sentiments are. I have read with great interest in several Opposition papers of the west a kind of thanksgiving about Mr. Tilley's return to public life, and they said he was honest and sober and conscientious. Now, sir, heaven forbid that I should detract from Mr. Tilley's good character and his qualities as a statesman and politician. I am prepared to say they are right in saying so. Mr. Tilley is a moral man, and I now ask him to state his real opinion in reference to the sale of the Pacific Railway Charter. (Great applause.) Does he think with Dr. Tupper that the transaction is justifiable? Does he think that if the money was necessary for carrying on the election it should be obtained by any means? I would like to know what he thinks of the revelations connected with the Northern Railway? This is a point affecting his own honor, as he was the man who brought down the proposition at that time to accept \$500,000 in lieu of their indebtedness to the Dominion, whereas we now have got a million from the company. I trust he was not aware of these transactions, and I believe, until he states to the contrary, that he did not know,

of them. If he did not know then he knows now, and when he knows then now why will he support such a party of corruption? I want to ask him if he is not acting as a sort of moral decoy duck in this constituency? Sir John said our Government was of "all sorts," alluding to a kind of drink sold in London taverns, and on that point I do not deny his right to speak as an authority (great laughter). I will say that if our Government is one of all sorts, that of Sir John and Tilley represents two sorts, the stronger and baser being represented by Sir John, and the weaker but purer sort being represented by my friend, Mr. Tilley (laughter). Of course I use these words entirely in a Parliamentary or Pickwickian sense. (Laughter.) It reminds me of a story of something that occurred while I was at college, years ago, in the old country, when it used to be part of the discipline that the undergraduates should attend chapel at certain times. Two of the students had been negligent of their duty in this respect, and they received a hint of severe penalties if they did not attend to this duty. Well, sure enough, on the next occasion they were in their places and were very attentive in the study of their prayer-books, so much so as to excite the suspicions of a Doctor who sat behind them, and who had a poor opinion of undergraduate piety. He took it into his head to examine the prayer-books of the pious pair, and he found that while the covers of the books were all right, the inside had been excavated, and the contents of the books had been replaced with a couple of rascally French novels. Sir John seems to have a hint from these gentlemen, for we have at one end of the Dominion the sober Mr. Tilley, and at the other end the highly respectable Mr. Gibbs,—furnishing excellent covers for the Cabinet, and between these pious covers we find Sir John A. Macdonald and Hector Langevin. (Laughter.) Mr. Tilley applies the averages in financial matters, while Sir John does the same in moral matters. Sir John says I do not pretend to be a saint, but I generally manage to have saints about me, and so, on the whole, we preserve a good average of sanctity. I may occasionally take a drop too much, but Mr. Tilley drinks nothing but cold water, and may be guilty of some financial irregularities; but Mr. Tilley is honest, and so for honesty, sobriety and piety they maintain a fair average. (Great laughter.)

Mr. Tilley, like Sir John Falstaff, who was not only witty, but also a source of wit to others, is not only respectable but a source of respectability for others. I desire to give credit to Mr. Tilley for promoting social reforms, for he deserves credit for it; but I do say to Mr. Tilley that, trusted as he is by his countrymen, he ought to consider whether, by his practice



and example, he is going to show that honesty and sobriety are essential to a man or merely accidents. Honesty and sobriety are essential to the fair standing of men in public life. I do not blame him for joining Sir John's party, nor when he was in the party could he well leave them in their hour of need, but I say that what he does now he does seriously, and he should hesitate before putting in his lot with men who do not repent of their evil deeds, but would repeat their iniquity again if they had the chance. I say that Mr. Tilley, whatever he does, should be very careful how he takes upon himself such a responsibility. I have to ask you, sir, and this intelligent audience, whether you approve of those acts which drove these men from power. I have to ask you, sir, and this intelligent

audience, whether you desire once more to have the country thrown into a state of depression, to have your taxes trebled, to see your Government demoralized, as in the United States. I want to ask you, do you want the leader of your Government to sell the Gov't for the purpose of corrupting the votes of the people? I will spare any man's private life, but a man who has disgraced himself and the Government to which he belonged I will not spare, but will denounce him from this platform. For ourselves, we don't desire to hold the offices any longer than the people consider us worthy to represent them, but if such a Government comes into power as is seeking to get into power, I will say a warning that we can expect nothing but ruin and decay.

then he  
them now  
of corrup-  
is not  
duck in  
d our God-  
ding to a  
erns, and  
right to  
ghter). I  
t is one of  
ley repre-  
baser be-  
and the  
esented by  
Of course  
liamentary  
r.) It re-  
g that oc-  
ars ago, in  
be part of  
rgraduates  
imes. Two  
t of their  
received a  
id not at-  
nough, on  
their places  
e study of  
as to excite  
at behind  
n of under-  
his head  
the pious  
e covers of  
inside had  
nts of the  
couple of  
n seems to  
hen, for we  
n the sober  
the highly  
ing excel-  
l between  
ohn A. Mac-  
(Laughter.)  
erages in  
Sir John  
Sir John  
aint, but I  
about me,  
rve a good  
ccasionally  
lley drinks  
y be guilty  
; but Mr.  
onesty, so-  
a fair aver-

lstaff, who  
a source of  
table but a  
ers. I de-  
for promot-  
rves credit  
Tilley that,  
rymen, he  
is practice